

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,157	07/24/2003	Jose Angel de la Rosa	100200997-1	9699
22879	7590 03/16/2005		EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY			JAWORSKI, FRANCIS J	
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			3737	

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/626,157 DE LA ROSA ET AL.	<i>₩</i>
10/626 157 DE LA ROSA ET AL	
10/020,101	
Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit	
Jaworski Francis J. 3737	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address	
Period for Reply	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	on.
Status	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 July 2003</u> .	
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits	is
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims	
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the application.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are rejected.	
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.	
Application Papers	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 24 July 2003 is/are: a) ☑ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	(4)
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.	(a).
, — , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 	
Attachment(s)	
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	

Application/Control Number: 10/626,157 Page 2

Art Unit: 3737

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United

States.

Claims 1-2, 9, 13 – 14, 16, 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Johnson (US4222274) which teaches an apparatus and method for an

external ultrasound transducer ring for sensing acoustic reflectivity parameters which is

movable by means of rotational and elevational motors 46, 66 respectively in order to

derive a 3D image set of an object by combination of individual ultrasound image scans

under control of computer processor 188..

Claims 3, 7 and 10-12 and 24 – 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Seo (US6685644) which teaches method and structure for an external

ultrasound imaging device 11, internal ultrasound imaging device 26 and a processor

18 which combines image portions as shown in Fig. 5 to create a composite 3D image

display of the object including manipulable presentations as in fig. 10

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Application/Control Number: 10/626,157

Art Unit: 3737

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4 – 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seo in view of Johnson or Dick et al (US4233988). Since Seo uses conventional external ultrasound imaging, it would have been obvious in view of Johnson to externally image with a ring imager or in view of Dick et al to image with an imaging ring in order to compile an external 3D image of an object.

Claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seo in view of Martin et al (US6275722). Whereas Seo does not mention MRI devices, it would have been obvious in view of Martin et al to reconstruct a composite 3D image using an internal MRI coil since this would allow the external imager to positionally reference the images.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seo as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Desai (US5433198)...

Whereas the former merely suggests in col. 1 that X-ray fluoroscopy may be used to track a probe tip, it would have been obvious in view of the latter to employ internal x-ray visualization in order to localize a probe tip such as in Seo where ultrasound is performing the main internal scan.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Martin et al for reasons analogous to that set forth above.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Martin et al as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Seo.

Art Unit: 3737

Whereas the former are silent as to overlay of images, it would have been obvious in view of the latter to blend-overlay internal and external images in order to obtain the adaptive benefits of both modes

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jaworski Francis J. at telephone number 571-272-4738.

FJJ:fjj

03142005.

Primary Examiner